

### **REMARKS**

The foregoing amendments and these remarks are in response to the Office Action dated July 14, 2006. Applicants hereby request a two month extension of time for filing this response. Authorization to charge Deposit Account No. 50-0951 is attached.

At the time of the Office Action, claims 1 and 3-12 were pending in the application. In the Office Action, an objection was raised to the drawings. Claims 1 and 3-12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). The objections and rejections are discussed in more detail below.

#### **I. Objections to the Drawings**

The drawings were objected to under 37 CFR §1.84(p)(5) because they include reference characters not mentioned in the description, namely  $\mu\text{C}$ , Port A1-A5. A revised Fig. 1 is enclosed, which deletes the labels  $\mu\text{C}$ , Port A1-A5. Withdrawal of the drawing objection is thus respectfully requested.

#### **II. Claim Rejections on Art**

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,642,711 to Kawate ("Kawate") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,179,512 to Fisher et al. ("Fisher"). Claims 3-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawate in view of Fisher as applied to claim 1, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,512,370 to James ("James"). Claims 6 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawate in view of Fisher as applied to claim 1, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,350,971 to Smolenski et al. ("Smolenski"). Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawate in view of Fisher and U.S. Patent No. 6,353,324 to Uber, III et al. ("Uber"). Claims 9 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawate in view of Fisher and Uber as applied to claim 8, and further in view of James. Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawate in view of Fisher and Uber as applied to claim 8, and further in view of Smolenski. Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawate in view of Fisher and James.

Kawate was discussed in the response to the previous Office Action. With regard to Fisher, applicant notes that this prior art document discloses a synchronous rectifier with the sensor coils 18' and 20' arranged on the same transformer core as the coils 10, 12' and 14'. In this case the sensor coils are connected to the gate of the MOSFET and not to the drain as with amended independent claim 1 of the present application. In Fisher, the parallel resonant circuit is not a part of an independently resonating oscillator as with the present invention. In Fisher, the sensor coils are connected to the gate of the MOSFET. In the invention according to the drawing, the sensor coils are connected to the drain.

In view of this difference, applicant has amended claims 1, 8 and 12 to recite that the sensor is connected to the drain of the MOSFET. It is clear why it is so important to have a low drain-source resistance, namely in the result that the oscillation of the resonant circuit is not changed much, neither stopped nor increasing too much. To the contrary, in Fisher, it is clear that the operation of the MOSFET is and must be synchronous to the operation frequency of the transformer. With the present invention, however, a switching means is provided in form of a MOSFET operating not synchronous to any operating frequency, but for any given time that can be freely chosen.

Thus, even if Kawate were combined with Fisher, a person of ordinary skill in the art would not arrive at a circuit arrangement or method having all of the features of claims 1, 8 and 12. For the foregoing reasons, claims 1, 8 and 12 are believed to relate to patentable subject matter, and to be in condition for allowance. The dependent claims are also believed to be in condition for allowance, because of their dependence upon an allowable base claim, and because of the further features recited.

### **III. Conclusion**

Applicants have made every effort to present claims which distinguish over the prior art, and it is thus believed that all claims are in condition for allowance. Nevertheless, Applicants invite the Examiner to call the undersigned if it is believed that a telephonic interview would expedite the prosecution of the application to an allowance. In view of the foregoing remarks,

Appln. No. 10/767,562

Amendment

Reply to Office Action dated July 14, 2006

Docket No. 304-820

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and prompt allowance of the pending claims.

Date: 12/14/06

Respectfully submitted,



J. Rodman Steele, Jr.

Registration No. 25,931

Sarah E. Smith

Registration No. 50,488

**AKERMAN SENTERFITT**

Post Office Box 3188

West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188

Telephone: (561) 653-5000